

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 PAUL WINFIELD,

12 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-03-2064 GEB GGH P

13 vs.

14 DAREL KATCHER, et al.,

15 Defendants.

ORDER

16 _____/
17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has
18 filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C.
19 § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate
20 Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (1) (B) and Local General
21 Order No. 262.

22 On April 22, 2005, the magistrate judge filed findings
23 and recommendations herein which were served on plaintiff and
24 which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the
25 findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days.
26

1 Plaintiff has filed objections to the findings and
2 recommendations.¹

3 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C.
4 § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304, this court has conducted a
5 de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the
6 entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to
7 be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

9 1. The findings and recommendations filed April 22,
10 2005, are adopted in full; and

11 2. This action is dismissed for plaintiff's repeated
12 failure to state a claim.

13 Dated: June 23, 2005

14
15 /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
16 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
17 United States District Judge
18
19
20
21

22
23 ¹Within the objections, in an apparent last ditch attempt to
24 rectify some of the glaring and repeated defects of his prior
25 filings, plaintiff continues to attempt to sue a party immune
26 from suit, and, in an action predicated on an Eighth Amendment
claim of cruel and unusual punishment for forced injections of a
psychotropic drug, does not seek injunctive relief, i.e.,
cessation of the injections, but only money damages, which seems
odd given the nature of his claims.